

## **REMARKS**

In response to the final office Action dated June 23, 2011, the Assignee respectfully requests continued examination and reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following remarks. The Assignee respectfully submits that the pending claims distinguish over the cited documents.

Claims 1, 5-14, 36, 39-46, and 52 are pending in this application. Claims 2-4, 15-35, 37-38, and 47-51 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

### **Petition for Extension of Time**

This response includes a petition for an extension of time. The Assignee petitions the Commissioner for a three month extension of time from June 23, 2011 to September 23, 2011. The 37 C.F.R. § 1.17 (a) (3) large entity fee was electronically paid at submission.

### **Rejection of Claims under § 103 (a)**

The Office rejected claims 1, 5-14, 36, 39-46, and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent 6,005,861 to Humpleman in view of U.S. Patent 6,493,875 to Eames, *et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent 6,732,366 to Russo, and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,890,168 to Inoue, *et al.*

This rejection has been rendered moot by amendment. These claims have been amended to recite, or to incorporate, features that are not disclosed or suggested by *Humpleman*, *Eames*, *Russo*, and *Inoue*. Independent claim 1, for example, has been amended to recite “a plurality of buses interconnecting internal components of a gateway.” Support for these features may be found at least at page 22, lines 16-17 of the as-filed application. These features are also illustrated in FIG. 6 of the as-filed application. Independent claims 36 and 52 have been amended to recite similar features.

At least these features are not obvious over *Humpleman, Eames, Russo, and Inoue*. The proposed combination of *Humpleman, Eames, Russo, and Inoue* describes a set-top box. Importantly, though, *Humpleman, Eames, Russo, and Inoue* expressly eschews “a plurality of buses interconnecting internal components of a gateway.” The proposed combination of *Humpleman, Eames, Russo, and Inoue* teaches that network interfaces are separated from the internal components of the set-top box. As *Humpleman* explains:

**The present invention, as shown in FIGS. 1 and 2, separates the functionality of the network interface units 32 from the set-top electronics 40. Conventionally, a set-top box contains a network interface unit whose components are internally connected by a bus to the set-top electronics components. By contrast, however, the present invention provides a separation of the network interface units 32 and the set-top electronics 40, with the internal network 34 interposed therebetween.** This arrangement permits multiple set-top electronics to be distributed throughout the home 36 less expensively, since the electronics of a network interface unit do not have to be duplicated for each set-top electronics. Additionally, having separate network interface units 32 coupled to different external networks and to a common internal network 34 frees the homeowner from being forced to receive all programming from a single source, such as the telephone or cable company. The separation also allows the homeowner to add, drop or change services simply by changing one of the network interface units 32, without the need for replacing all of the set-top electronics 40 throughout the home 36.

See U.S. Patent 6,005,861 to *Humpleman* at column 4, line 66 through column 5, line 19 (emphasis added). Here *Humpleman* explains that conventional the network interface units are connected by a bus to the internal components of the set-top box. *Humpleman's* invention, in contrast, separates the network interface units from the internal components of the set-top box. Indeed, *Humpleman* further explains:

In certain embodiments, a “master” set-top box is provided with multiple network interface units. **However, this embodiment is logically the same as described above, as the network interface units are connected in this embodiment to the internal network, and not by a bus to the set-top electronics.**

See U.S. Patent 6,005,861 to Humpleman at column 5, lines 20-25 (emphasis added). Here, even if the network interface units are included in a “master” set top box, the network interface units are NOT connected by a bus to the internal components of the set-top box.

The Office must immediately see that the independent claims distinguish. Independent claim 1 recites “a plurality of buses interconnecting internal components of a gateway.” Independent claim 1 further recites “a media bus of the plurality of buses ... connected to the multiple pairs of the tuner and the demodulator,” with the media bus having “a first media bus output connected to the system data bus.” Independent claim 1 further recites a “processor,” “memory,” and “a video overlay processor” that are connected, respectively, to the “system data bus” and the “media bus.” Independent claim 1 further recites “a network bus of the plurality of buses ... connected to the system data bus” and “a data switch connected to the network bus.” The proposed combination of *Humpleman*, *Eames*, *Russo*, and *Inoue* expressly eschews network interfaces that are connected by a bus to the internal components of a set-top box. Because the independent claims all recite “a plurality of buses interconnecting internal components of a gateway,” the independent claims cannot be obvious over *Humpleman*, *Eames*, *Russo*, and *Inoue*.

Claims 1, 5-14, 36, 39-46, and 52, then, cannot be obvious over *Humpleman*, *Eames*, *Russo*, and *Inoue*. The independent claims recite many distinguishing features, and the dependent claims incorporate these distinguishing features. One of ordinary skill in the art, then, would not think that these claims are obvious. The Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of these claims.

---

If any questions arise, the Examiner is invited contact the undersigned at (919) 469-2629 or [scott@scottzimmerman.com](mailto:scott@scottzimmerman.com).

**37 C.F.R. § 1.8 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically transmitted via the USPTO EFS web interface on September 16, 2011.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "S. P. Zimmerman", is written over a large, faint, circular watermark or stamp.

Scott P. Zimmerman  
Attorney for the Assignee  
Reg. No. 41,390